



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/059,815	01/28/2002	Paul Christopher Eastham	5693P003	6764

48102 7590 01/11/2006

NETWORK APPLIANCE/BLAKELY
12400 WILSHIRE BLVD
SEVENTH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025-1030

EXAMINER

CHAI, LONGBIT

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2131

DATE MAILED: 01/11/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/059,815

Applicant(s)

EASTHAM, PAUL CHRISTOPHER

Examiner

Longbit Chai

Art Unit

2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 December 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 10-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 10-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1 – 29 have been presented for examination. Claims 1 – 9 have been cancelled in an amendment filed 12/19/2005. Claims 10 – 11 and 21 – 29 have been withdrawn due to the restriction requirement. The amendment filed have been entered and made of record. Presently, pending claims are 12 – 20.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed on 12/19/2005 with respect to instant claims have been fully considered and, as a result, the finality of a rejection is withdrawn in order to apply a new ground of rejection.

During a telephone conversation with Attorney Jordan M. Becker on 12/28/2005, a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I: Claims 12 – 20. Affirmation of this election must be made by Applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 10 – 11 and 21 – 29 are withdrawn from further consideration by the Examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 19 and 20 are objected to because of the following informalities: "the attributes" should be "the attribute names". Appropriate correction is required.

Election / Restrictions

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

- I. (Group 1) Claims 12 – 20 drawn to a network authentication method through the communications with the database initiated from a network cache, classified in class 713, subclass 168.
- II. (Group 2) Claims 10 – 11 and 21 – 29 drawn to a method for automatically configuring a network cache associated with an object-oriented database structure, classified in class 707, subclass 100.

Inventions I and II are distinct from each other if they are shown to be separately usable. The following cases instants:

Invention I has separate utility such as network security for user authentications.

Invention II has separate utility such as automatically configuring a network cache associated with an object-oriented database structure.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification and utility restriction for examination purpose as indicated is proper.

Examiner acknowledges that Applicant has elected Group I and as such this Office action only addresses the claimed inventions of Group I: Claims 12 – 20.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 102 that forms the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 12 – 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.102(e) as being anticipated by Dugan et al. (U.S. Patent 6363411).

As per claim 13 (& 12), Dugan teaches a device, comprising:
a network cache (Dugan: Column 14 Line 1 – 5); and
a user interface (Dugan: Column 12 Line 49 – 50) to allow an operator to enter a character string known by the operator to be within a user object located in a database (Dugan: Column 18 Line 28 / 45 and Column 59 Line 53 – 60) such that the character string is used to automatically configure the network cache (Dugan: Column 60 Line 9 – 11) so that the network cache is able to communicate with a database (Dugan: Column 52 Line 17 – 21 and Column 47 Line 56 – 59) to authenticate a user (Dugan: Column 48 Line 24 – 27, Column 1 Line 31 – 32, Column 67 Line 38 / Line 55 – 57: Dugan teaches

Art Unit: 2131

each of network application services, e.g. (a) agent Log-on/Log-off as disclose (Dugan: Column 67 Line 38) and (b) authentication as one of the primary network application services (Dugan: Column 1 Line 31 – 32), should have its own respective cache manager (Dugan: Column 48 Line 24 – 27 / Line 41 – 42)).

As per claim 14, Dugan teaches searching for a character string in a plurality of objects located in a database (Dugan: Column 18 Line 28 / 45 and Column 59 Line 53: a character string as the customer name);

selecting an object from a subset of objects found to contain the character string (Dugan: Column 48 Line 24 – 27: selecting a particular object instance of application from different service applications in conjunction with different objects);

retrieving the object (Dugan: Column 47 Line 58 – 59);

receiving a selection of the attribute name associated with the character string in the object (Dugan: Column 59 Line 53 – 60 and Column 43 Line 51 – 52: the logical name / object reference ID is equivalent to an attribute name (as distinct from the actual attribute value)); and

storing the attribute name in a configuration file in the network cache (Dugan: Column 60 Line 9 – 11).

As per claim 15, Dugan teaches the character string is a user ID (Dugan, Column 18 Line 28 / 45).

As per claim 16, Dugan teaches retrieving the object further comprises receiving as input a password Corresponding to the user ID (Dugan, Column 67 Line 57).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 17 – 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dugan et al. (U.S. Patent 6363411), in view of Ouellette et al. (U.S. Patent 6321259).

As per claim 17, Dugan does not disclose expressly the attribute name corresponding to each group ID in the object is selected and stored in the network cache.

Ouellette teaches the attribute name corresponding to each group ID in the object is selected and stored in the network cache (Ouellette: Column 7 Line 4 – 29 & Dugan: Column 60 Line 9 – 11 and Column 41 Line 44 – 48: Ouellette teaches the attribute of group ID and Dugan teaches the corresponding attribute names (as the

object reference ID) associated with hierarchical object structure (i.e., recursive loading of all classes) is stored in the cache).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Ouellette within the system of Dugan because (a) Dugan teaches an intelligent network architecture that can provide various network services such as security, validation and authentications (Dugan: Column 1 Line 15 – 33), and (b) Ouellette teaches a hierarchical LDAP database server with an attribute inheritance schema organized in a hierarchical object structure for authentication purpose (Ouellette, Column 8 Line 38 – 43 / Line 28 – 32 and Abstract Line 1 – 3).

As per claim 18, Dugan as modified teaches if a non-parental group object is found to contain the user ID; the network cache retrieves the non-parental group object (Ouellette, Column 8 Line 1 – 4 and Column 7 Line 23 – 29 & Figure 5: the options as taught by Ouellette can have either one single group (i.e. parent group) or multiple groups associated with user ID (the optional groups are interpreted as non-parent groups associated with user ID);

receives a selection of the attribute names associated with attributes utilized to identify the non-parental group (Ouellette, Column 8 Line 1 – 4 & Dugan: Column 59 Line 53 – 60 and Column 43 Line 51 – 52: the logical name / object reference ID is equivalent to an attribute name (as distinct from the actual attribute value)), and stores

Art Unit: 2131

the attribute names in a configuration file in the network cache (Dugan: Column 60 Line 9 – 11).

As per claim 19, Dugan does not disclose expressly the network cache guesses which attributes to select once the object from the subset of objects has been retrieved.

Ouellette teaches the network cache guesses which attributes to select once the object from the subset of objects has been retrieved (Ouellette, Column 8 Line 1 – 4 and Column 7 Line 23 – 29 & Figure 5: the options as taught by Ouellette can have either one single group (i.e. parent group) or multiple groups associated with user ID (the optional groups are interpreted as non-parent groups associated with user ID and thereby the network cache needs to guess which optional group other than the direct parent group once the object from the subset of objects has been retrieved).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Ouellette within the system of Dugan because (a) Dugan teaches an intelligent network architecture that can provide various network services such as security, validation and authentications (Dugan: Column 1 Line 15 – 33), and (b) Ouellette teaches a hierarchical LDAP database server with an attribute inheritance schema organized in a hierarchical object structure for authentication purpose (Ouellette, Column 8 Line 38 – 43 / Line 28 – 32 and Abstract Line 1 – 3).

Art Unit: 2131

As per claim 20, Dugan as modified teaches the attributes stored in the configuration file are checked for correctness (Ouellette: Column 8 Line 45 – 46: the attribute name must be validated and correct to further ensure the attribute value is also correct).


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Longbit Chai whose telephone number is 571-272-3788. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00am-4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz R. Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


LBC

Longbit Chai
Examiner
Art Unit 2131


Primary Examiner
AU 2131
1/5/06